

THE DREISER NEWSLETTER

Volume Twelve, Number One

Spring 1981

SISTER CARRIE RESTORED

Richard W. Dowell
Indiana State University

In explaining the editorial principles of the Pennsylvania edition of *Sister Carrie*, Textual Editor James L. W. West III writes, "In accepting advice, cuts, and revisions from Jug and Henry, Dreiser was acting more as editor than as author. In the strictest sense, his authorial function ceased after he inscribed the holograph draft of *Sister Carrie*" (p. 580). Such cuts and revisions, the Pennsylvania editors contend, were attempts to create a more marketable novel by streamlining the narrative and excising sexual references deemed potentially offensive to prospective publishers; thus, Dreiser's original intentions and the integrity of the philosophy and characterization were often ignored. As Dreiser was a beginning novelist whose background in journalism had inured him to extensive editing, he typically deferred to his more-experienced friend, Arthur Henry, and his better-educated wife. The end result, however, was a significantly altered *Sister Carrie*. To recapture Dreiser's original novel, a work they consider "infinitely richer, more complex, and more tragic" (p. 532) than that ultimately published by Doubleday, Page and Company and since considered the standard text, the Pennsylvania editors have returned to Dreiser's manuscript as it was before nonauthorial alterations were introduced. All subsequent revisions and deletions by Henry, Mrs. Dreiser, typists and Doubleday, Page editors were rejected unless they were necessitated by mechanical correctness or seem to reflect Dreiser's uninfluenced judgments. Using these principles, the Pennsylvania editors restored approximately thirty-six thousand words.

Comparing the two versions of *Sister Carrie*, a reader might well conclude that many of the nonauthorial revisions and deletions were examples of sensible editing, for Dreiser in the manuscript was frequently guilty of overexplaining the ramifications of a scene, launching into lengthy philosophical and allusive flights, or including stretches of rather insignificant dialogue and thus had good reason to accept the suggestions of his advisors. However, he often accepted some editing that significantly altered the setting, characterization and under-

lying philosophy.

Perhaps the most obvious victim of the blue pencil was Chicago itself, particularly its seamier side. Many street scenes, especially some involving Carrie's job-hunting, were struck out, thereby eliminating vivid descriptions of the city's color, sounds and activity as well as its filth, indifference and depravity. Most damaging to Dreiser's theme was the excision of several incidents depicting the city's capacity for sexual exploitation. Upon bringing Carrie into Chicago from Columbia City, Dreiser had warned that a girl could be easily corrupted by the "cosmopolitan standard of virtue." Certainly in the manuscript version Chicago quietly offered Carrie that opportunity. On two occasions, she was offered jobs explicitly contingent on sexual favors (pp. 27 & 258-9); at another time, while standing at the foot of the stairs to Minnie's apartment, she was the target of several groups of young toughs who whistled, shouted and ogled her as they passed (p. 51). In the factory, she was fascinated and somewhat envious when her fellow employees described their tawdry activities of the previous night (pp. 54-5), and once settled with Drouet at Ogden Place, she discovered her next-door neighbor to be "a stout, over-experienced, fakish sort of individual, who had one type of woman in mind when the name of woman was mentioned, and who was forever on the *qui vive* for some little encounter with the fair sex which might work to his advantage" (p. 250). All of these scenes were cut before *Sister Carrie* was published, making Chicago seem far less threatening than Dreiser had originally intended. New York scenes were cut less severely; however, here too the seamier side of the theatre world was de-emphasized, passages referring to men eyeing Carrie from the front rows or sending her "sensual" notes having been struck out with regularity. All in all, by restoring such passages and returning to Dreiser's original use of the actual names of people and places well-known at the turn of the century, the Pennsylvania editors have recaptured some of the richness and authenticity lost through revision.

The restoration of altered and deleted passages also added greater complexity to the characterization. Carrie, for example, became somewhat more contemplative and morally troubled, and though her "average little conscience" was ultimately overwhelmed by material considerations, it spoke out more frequently and vigorously in the Pennsylvania edition. Also returned to the text were several paragraphs describing Carrie's performing her role in "Under the Gaslight" and involving herself in other backstage activities. Though rather cumbersome, these restored passages do make Carrie's fascination with the theatre and ultimate success on the stage a bit more plausible. Most important, however, the manuscript Carrie was

less a drifter and more a calculating survivor. This quality was most clearly evident in an excised passage following Drouet's decision to leave their apartment after discovering Carrie's interest in Hurstwood. At this point, Carrie decided to look for work and after a depressing search encountered the lecherous manager of a dishonest picture-framing company who "ogled her most salaciously and . . . tacitly conveyed to her one of the most brazen propositions imaginable--seeking to buy her services and favor for five dollars per week" (p. 259). Though repulsed by the man's appearance and his offer, Carrie did not turn it down; in fact, she was relieved by the security of a job. "She knew that if she took that place," Dreiser wrote, "it would be to put herself in the way of disagreeable familiarity and solicitation, and she hesitated to think that anything could bring her to it. Still the day had gone by and five dollars was five dollars" (p. 259). Then, when Hurstwood intervened and took her to New York via Montreal, she was not the passive Carrie that emerged after revision. Instead, she analyzed her situation carefully, realized that the loss of Drouet would mean hardship in Chicago, listened to Hurstwood's promises of a "nice home" and "a decent life in another city," and finally succumbed to the luxury of the Pullman car, the excitement of travel and a shopping spree in Montreal. As these and other deleted or altered passages suggest, the Carrie originally conceived by Dreiser was a tougher, more calculating character than she became in the Doubleday, Page edition.

Drouet's character was also more complex and less sympathetic as it was originally conceived. In the manuscript, he was not only more deliberate in his initial attempts to seduce Carrie but also totally unfaithful. Over four hundred words were eventually deleted from Chapter XII in the manuscript detailing Drouet's womanizing. "On his trade pilgrimages," Dreiser had originally written, "he was like to forget Carrie entirely. She came into his mind when all later divinities were out, or when he was on his way back to Chicago. . . . He would enter Carrie's presence with all the spirit of a lover--away from her would forsake her memory with the ease of the unattached masher, which, after all, he was" (pp. 105-6). Also, his promise to marry Carrie after completing a "fictitious real estate deal" was explicitly labeled "a sop to Carrie's matrimonial desires" designed to make her "feel contented with her state, the while he winged his merry, thoughtless round" (p. 135). Thus, in view of his own faithlessness and deceit, Drouet's outrage at Carrie's defection to Hurstwood initially had the distinct taint of hypocrisy. Finally, when Drouet attempted to court Carrie after her theatrical success in New York, the effort was characterized by a crudity and insensitivity that were lessened by revision. All in all, as first created by Dreiser, the "old butterfly" had wings that

were somewhat more sullied.

Hurstwood's portrayal was perhaps most significantly altered by the revision. In the manuscript version, he emerged clearly as a more devious and lustful character who was to a greater extent responsible for his fate. The original Hurstwood was clearly the more blatant hypocrite, maintaining the decorous public life that his business position demanded while being a philanderer in private long before he met Carrie. In a passage later cut, Dreiser described Hurstwood as one who enjoyed "those more unmentionable resorts of vice--the gilded chambers of shame with which Chicago was so liberally cursed" (p. 44). In another deleted section, Dreiser implied that Hurstwood was given to entertaining women at his own resort after hours. On that occasion, he invited Drouet to return about midnight. "Is she a blonde?" Drouet responded, elated. Certainly, Hurstwood's reply gave no indication that Drouet had guessed incorrectly (p. 48). Compared to Drouet, Dreiser wrote in an excised description, Hurstwood "saw a trifle more clearly the necessities of our social organization, but he was more unscrupulous in the matter of sinning against it. He did not, as a matter of fact, conduct himself as loosely as Drouet, but it was entirely owing to a respect for his situation. In the actual matter of a decision and a consummation, he was worse than Drouet. He more deliberately set aside the canons of right as he understood them" (p. 106).

In his attempts to seduce Carrie, Hurstwood in the manuscript was both more passionate and explicit about his desires and once he fled with Carrie to Montreal sought "a complete matrimonial union" immediately after appeasing her with a shopping spree (p. 300). In fact, Hurstwood's pursuit prompted Dreiser to expound at some length on the potential doom of men whose "only thought is to obtain pleasure and shun responsibility" (p. 132). During one of the longest philosophical passages deleted, Dreiser foreshadowed Hurstwood's fate in this regard. "When, after error, pain falls as a lash," Dreiser warned, "[men guilty of adultery] do not comprehend that their suffering is due to misbehavior. Many such an individual is so lashed by necessity and law that he falls fainting to the ground, dies hungry in the gutter or rotting in jail and it never once flashes across his mind that he has been lashed only in so far as he has persisted in attempting to trespass the boundaries which necessity sets" (p. 132).

The manuscript version also made Hurstwood more culpable during the theft of the money from the resort safe. As the scene was eventually revised, the safe door accidentally locked after Hurstwood had decided not to abscond with the day's proceeds and was in the process of returning the money to the

proper boxes. As the situation was originally conceived, however, the safe door locked when he had finally determined to take the money and was returning the empty boxes after filling his satchel. Immediately preceding the clicking of the safe, the manuscript version had read:

Could he not get away? What would be the use remaining. He would never get such a chance again. He emptied the good money into the satchel. There was something fascinating about the soft green stack--the loose silver and gold. He felt sure now that he could not leave that. No, no. He would do it. He would lock the safe before he had time to change his mind.

He went over and restored the empty boxes. Then he pushed the door to for somewhere near the sixth time. He wavered, thinking, putting his hand to his brow.
(pp. 270-1)

Though Dreiser equivocated slightly in the final line of that passage, his original intent was clearly to make Hurstwood's flight from Chicago and decline in New York the results of a much more willful act than it ultimately became.

Ames' role was significantly expanded in the manuscript, making him not only Carrie's cultural and moral advisor, but also a possible suitor at some future time. Certainly Carrie's romantic interest in Ames was obvious prior to the deletions and revisions. On the night she was to dine with him, a scene ultimately cut when Dreiser rewrote the ending of Chapter XLIX of the manuscript, Carrie dressed with exceeding care to maximize her beauty and during the evening hung on Ames' every word, her "eyes . . . shining with suppressed fire" (p. 484). When during one of his philosophical flights Ames expressed the opinion that failure in love was not so tragic, she became wistful and ultimately left his company dispirited by the sense that Ames could never care for her in other than an intellectual way. "Carrie looked back," Dreiser had originally written, "irrepressible feeling showing in her eyes, which she quickly shielded, with her lashes. She felt very much alone, very much as if she were struggling hopelessly and unaided, as if such a man as he would never care to draw nearer" (p. 487). It was Carrie's frustration over Ames that originally inspired the "Oh, blind striving of the human heart" passage, which Dreiser ultimately revised and shifted to the end of the novel.

Carrie's assumption that Ames would never "draw nearer" was not necessarily accurate, as Dreiser originally conceived their relationship. At dinner Ames had found Carrie the "most pleasing character present" and recognized in her "that sym-

pathy and attention which he needed to show his mind at its best. . . . Thus the bond between them was drawn closer than they knew" (p. 481). As they talked, their "eyes had met, and for the first time Ames felt the shock of sympathy, keen and strong" (p. 483). By the time Carrie made dispirited departure, Ames had been deeply moved by their evening together. "He followed to the door--wide awake to her beauty" (p. 487). The restoration of this dinner scene by the Pennsylvania editors makes it difficult for a reader to believe that Carrie had seen the last of Ames.

As the Pennsylvania edition also demonstrates, the dialogue of the manuscript underwent some revision at the hands of Arthur Henry, Mrs. Dreiser, and possibly the Doubleday, Page editors. It was made less profane, slangy, ungrammatical and at times realistic. Hurstwood's blasphemous references to God, Jesus, Christ, and the Lord were cut by half, often replaced by such innocuous expressions as "George." The same can be said of other instances where Hurstwood's speech became less than gentlemanly. For example, when he received Mrs. Hurstwood's demand for money "at once," Hurstwood in a burst of anger had threatened, "I'll make her change her tone if I've got to wring her neck" (p. 236). That threat was subsequently toned down to the more urbane intent "to use force." Carrie's blunt accusations that Drouet and Hurstwood had "lied" (pp. 226, 278) were softened to the more ladylike "deceived," and her insistence that she would not "live" (p. 151) with Hurstwood unless he married her was altered to the more ambiguous "stay with you." Mrs. Hurstwood also became a bit more genteel, consistently referring to her daughter as "Jessica" instead of "Jess," as Dreiser had originally intended. The beleaguered strikers in Brooklyn were denied the satisfaction of calling Hurstwood and his police protection "bastards" (p. 424); theatrical agents used "whom" (p. 382) when the objective case demanded it; and flirtatious but spurned stage managers were reduced to speaking sarcastically about Carrie's talent rather than her anatomy (p. 250). Overall, the restoration of Dreiser's somewhat more colorful dialogue is not particularly extensive; however, it does add to the novel's realism by removing an occasional false note created by prudish editing.

The Pennsylvania editors' decisions were not limited, however, to the restoration of material deleted or revised on the advice of Mrs. Dreiser, Arthur Henry and others. There was also material added after the manuscript had been completed, specifically the chapter titles and the paragraphs that concluded the novel after Hurstwood's suicide. In each case, the decision was to reject these additions. It was the feeling of the Pennsylvania editors that the chapter titles, written by

both Dreiser and Henry, were added to restore some of the philosophical implications lost through block cuts; therefore, since this material had been restored to the text, the titles became superfluous. In regard to the paragraphs following Hurstwood's suicide, it was decided that they did not necessarily represent Dreiser's wishes regarding the novel's conclusion. In fact, the final handwritten version of these concluding paragraphs was a fair copy prepared with some revisions by Mrs. Dreiser. Thus, the Pennsylvania editors have rejected these paragraphs on both circumstantial and artistic grounds, noting that they are "contrived and unnatural--more like clumsy graftings than natural parts of the novel--and they were almost surely added on the advice of Henry or Jug" (p. 585). On the other hand, concluding *Sister Carrie* with Hurstwood's suicide was clearly Dreiser's intention before the intervention of Henry and Mrs. Dreiser. Also, the Pennsylvania editors contend, Hurstwood's suicide is artistically a consistent and natural conclusion.

In the final analysis, the Pennsylvania edition is certainly a different *Sister Carrie* in several respects. Whether or not it is a better novel will depend on the preferences of individual readers. For some, the blocks of seemingly excessive detail and superfluous dialogue, the occasionally awkward sentencings and pedestrian word selection, the instances of gratuitous and at times pretentious literary allusions, and the obvious redundancies may outweigh other considerations and militate against the use of Dreiser's original manuscript as the base text for *Sister Carrie*. There will also be those who agree with Mencken that the shift of emphasis to Hurstwood in the latter stages created a structural weakness. For them, the Pennsylvania editors' decision to conclude the novel with Hurstwood's suicide will compound that weakness. On the other hand, there will doubtless be many who feel that the return to Dreiser's original intentions strengthens *Sister Carrie*, creating a darker, more realistic and thus more compelling work.

Regardless of the decision concerning the relative merits of the *Sister Carrie* texts, however, few will deny that the Pennsylvania edition makes a major contribution to Dreiser scholarship by giving readers an alternative text that represents his initial plans for the novel. Also, for those who have not had access to Dreiser manuscripts, this edition will provide a valuable opportunity to study his tendencies and eccentricities regarding sentence structure and punctuation--stylistic mannerisms that were typically altered and regularized by various secretaries and editors during the publication process. The Pennsylvania edition also includes seventy pages of historical commentary, complete with copious notes on the text, pictures of scenes and establishments mentioned in the

novel, and maps locating crucial points in Chicago and New York. There are also more than a hundred pages of textual commentary, which includes notes, the revised endings of Chapters XLIX and L, and listings of word divisions, previous editions of the novel, block cuts suggested by Henry and accepted by Dreiser, chapter titles from the 1900 Doubleday, Page edition, and all significant substantive and accidental emendations made in Dreiser's original manuscript. A photo-offset reproduction of the text of the Pennsylvania edition without the historical or textual apparatus is available in a paperback Viking Penguin edition, which includes an introduction by Alfred Kazin.

AFTERWORD

On April 22, 1981, the date set aside to celebrate the publication of the Pennsylvania Edition of *Sister Carrie*, Maurice English, Director of the University of Pennsylvania Press, received the following message: "I have waited 81 years for this event, and I personally thank you for this Pennsylvania Edition of my *Sister Carrie*. Doubleday, Page were imbeciles, in 1900, and I told them that some day a publisher with vision, integrity, grit, and professional competence would restore my first book to its original intentions. As I remember, I made about \$68 on that 1900 printing. I wish you better success with the rejuvenated novel, and while I shall claim no royalties, I think you should know that at your market price for *Carrie*, I couldn't have afforded a copy in 1900. It is a beautiful book, in my favorite blue and away with Doubleday, Page's insufferable red cover! I have enjoyed all the publicity, and my only regret is that I didn't bring the book to you in the first place." This note was mystically signed (with the assistance of medium Neda Westlake) "Theodore Dreiser." The *DN* is gratified to be able to reprint this brief but most authoritative review.

DREISER IN JAPAN

Kiyohiko Murayama

Theodore Dreiser does not enjoy the great reputation he deserves in Japan. He is known there to only a small part of the reading public who in general are fairly familiar with American literature, reading the works of minor writers as well as major writers through widely published Japanese translations. There are even complete works in Japanese translation of some major writers, including Hemingway and Faulkner. Dreiser's works have been translated into Japanese, too, but many of them have been out of print for a long time.

His translated works include *Sister Carrie*, *Jennie Gerhardt*, *The Bulwark*, some of his short stories, and parts from *Twelve Men* and *The Gallery of Women*, most of which are unavailable today. As for *An American Tragedy*, there are at least five editions of its Japanese translation, most of which are still available. The film version of it, *A Place in the Sun*, was so popular in Japan that it has been replayed on the Japanese TV network many times. Moreover, *Seishun no Satetsu* (*A Failure of Youth*) (1968), a novel by an established Japanese writer, Tatsuzo Ishikawa, was a best seller at one stage and is said to have borrowed its plot from *An American Tragedy*. Still Dreiser is at best a mere name to many Japanese.

The desolate state of Dreiser's reputation reflects the general trends in the academic world of the study of American literature in Japan. It has not been too popular in Japan to study Dreiser. Today, for many Japanese scholars the most important novelists from the United States are Herman Melville and William Faulkner, whereas Dreiser has been regarded an insipid novelist. But his reputation has been changing and is still changing, as the political and cultural situations have been moving along in Japan.

In prewar Japan the study of American literature was not a legitimate field of scholarship. Nobody would dare to take up an American author as a major subject of study, especially in the English departments at the respectable Imperial univer-

sities. As a result, much of the introduction and translation of contemporary American literature was done by people outside the academic world. Particularly members of the radical literary movements were interested in contemporary American literature, because it was regarded as progressive and its main stream seemed to be realism. Most of Upton Sinclair's works, for instance, were translated into Japanese. Also, some people were interested in American literature's modernistic aspects. In either case, it was one of the channels of liberation from oppressive semi-feudal Japan.

Interest in American realism could indicate a rebellious attitude toward the established academic world. Matsuo Takagaki in Tokyo and Masaru Shiga in Osaka, who are thought to have initiated in Japan the scholarly study of American literature, showed serious interests in the tradition of realism in American literature. Characteristically both of them were professors not at Imperial universities but at private universities. It was Takagaki who wrote a small book about Dreiser, published in 1933, and this still remains the only book-form study of Dreiser written in Japanese ever published (though there is another book about Dreiser in Japanese that is a mixture of study-guides and collected essays by several Japanese scholars.)

On the other hand, Hideo Kobayashi, who is unquestionably regarded as the leading literary critic in Japan today, published an essay "*Shosetsu no Mondai* (Problems of the Novel)" in 1932 when he was establishing himself as an anti-Marxist critic. In this article he discussed Dreiser's stylistic impotence in conveying realities to readers, quoting a passage from the original English text of *An American Tragedy*. Responding to this, Junichiro Tanizaki, the master of the novel and an aesthete to the backbone, quoting the same passage in his *Bunsho Dokuhon* (*A Reader in the Technique of Writing*) (1934), argued that it merely showed the difference between languages. From this exchange we can know that Dreiser was widely read and discussed even among unsympathetic novelists and critics in the Japan of the 1930's.

As the Japanese escalated the invasion of China, before the end of the 1930's, the revolutionary movements, including the literary one, had been devastated by the imperial police. Soon after that, even liberals' activities were not allowed. The study of the enemy's literature was unwelcome, while the use of English words was banned in people's everyday lives. The publication of any other materials than militaristic propaganda was impossible not only because of the persecution by the police but because of the shortage of paper.

In post-war Japan the study of American literature became respectable. American literature courses were set up even in the former Imperial universities. Many scholars began to study American authors with an earnestness that was almost enough for them in a short time to make up for the void created by the war, and they were eager to learn everything from the scholarship in the United States. As a result they were under the strong influence of the then prevailing tendency in the American literary and academic world. What they learned was the reverential attitude toward the sophisticated stylistic complexity, the premise that literary art should be autonomous, the rejection of socio-historical interpretations of works of art, etc. In short, it was anything but an influence that would have encouraged the study of realistic literary works containing social criticism like Dreiser's. As a matter of fact, Dreiser appeared to be proof of the inadequacy of social-minded realists.

Even in the unfavorable conditions of the 1950's and 1960's, there have been a certain number of scholars who continued to study Dreiser's literature and publish articles here and there. Such movies as *Twilight* and *A Place in the Sun* were imported to be shown to Japanese audiences. And at those times, in order to promote them or rather to take advantage of their popularity, the original books were translated and published, but apparently this did not help many Japanese realize the significance of Dreiser's work. For almost thirty years after the end of the war, the study of Dreiser was constantly discouraged in Japan.

In recent years, however, Dreiser's works have been included in some of the collections of translated masterpieces of world literature. This never was the case with the previous collections, though many such works exist. Whether this change should be seen as a reflection of the increasing interest in him in the United States or the result of the Japanese readers' development cannot be decided, but today no one would dare to scoff at Dreiser; at least among the Japanese students of American literature, the importance of his work has been recognized at last.

Recently, a Japanese publisher, Rinsen Bookstore, has announced that they will publish the 20-volume *Works of Theodore Dreiser* this year. All of his works except his letters will be included: his novels, short stories, plays, poems, essays, autobiographies, and travels, in their original English texts. Although it will be a very limited edition of 200 copies, this publication will mark the zenith of his reemergence in recent years. While his reputation in Japan is still meager, he is regaining it slowly but surely.

DATING A "LETTER TO LOUISE"

Philip L. Gerber

State University of New York, Brockport

Louise Campbell's publication (1959) of a slim volume of correspondence from Theodore Dreiser was cause for joy, for Mrs. Campbell had been the novelist's most consistent and dependable aide from 1917 until his death. Apart from its obvious contribution of printing Dreiser's letters to her, most for the first time, *Letters to Louise* was enhanced by a running commentary treating the Campbell-Dreiser relationship over these thirty years, and it possessed the ultimate advantage that both commentary and editing were the work of Mrs. Campbell herself. Such impeccability in credentials should make *Letters to Louise* invulnerable to criticism. However, we all slip at one time or another. Mrs. Campbell's lapse occurs on page 35 of her book, with the letter whose date she gives as August 1, 1926.

On this date Dreiser was in Europe, having sailed with Helen Richardson for Norway. The voyage was a holiday, Dreiser's first indulgence following his huge success with *An American Tragedy*. While he vaguely planned to accumulate data on Charles T. Yerkes, Jr., to be used in writing *The Stoic*, his major plan for work while abroad involved reading galley proofs of his revised edition of *The Financier*. Long-planned, the "new" *Financier* was seen as a step toward completing his "Trilogy of Desire" and toward the restyling of all of his novels, for the purpose of winning greater critical sanction and thereby strengthening his campaign to win the Nobel Prize. The revision had been relegated almost exclusively to Mrs. Campbell. She was to prepare a script which Boni and Liveright would set in galleys and which, in turn, Dreiser would correct, adding and deleting material as he saw fit. He planned that galleys should be sent to him abroad, but since a set of galleys was available shortly before his sailing date, Dreiser carried the new book with him when the *S. S. Frederick VIII* left its Manhattan dock on June 22. Dreiser took one good look at the passengers and decided that this 1926 crossing promised to be a dull trip. The galley proofs were insurance against boredom, and he fell to work at once. Concurrently, another set of

Financier galleys and her typewritten script were mailed to Louise Campbell in Philadelphia. Dreiser's final instructions to her included a list of addresses at which he might be reached at intervals during his travels. Louise was instructed to mail her corrected galleys, insured, to whichever of these locations seemed most appropriate.

It is within this context that Mrs. Campbell places the letter in question, and she comments in introducing it that Dreiser was "very anxious to speed publication of the revised *Financier*, for he wrote me from Europe again on August 1:"

Dear Louise:

Please prepare and forward short comprehensive synopses of both *Financier* and *Titan*. Lengel suggests it might be done by giving first principal characters of *Financier* in their order with their part in story. Next same for *Titan*. Publishers agree it will be a good thing. All ms to 45 inc. received. How much did that cost--express.

Have changed 1st chapter or rather have made chapter 3 and chapter 1 into chapter one. Also cut out much of the romanticism. Seems very effective now.

T.D.

Not in any sense a "big" letter, the note is innocuous enough and sufficiently routine to pass muster with the cursory reader (most of us most of the time). Only when one has reason to press for a closer scrutiny do important inconsistencies with known fact arise, and then, before long, every area of the letter is called into question.

Dreiser and Mrs. Campbell understood the difference between a manuscript and a set of proofs and were not given to confusing them. Why, then, should Dreiser acknowledge receipt of "manuscripts" when he had specifically directed Mrs. Campbell (16 June 1926) to forward him "the proofs--not the text" of his book?

Also, the letter makes a poor fit in the sequence of Dreiser's 1926 correspondence. If on 1 August he had received 45 chapters of his novel, as he appears to say, then why should he write Louise near the end of that month and say, "I was about to cable you to send the revised *Financier* to me at Paris but have decided to wait and clean it up finally in N.Y."?

Even supposing that Dreiser did want synopses of his two Cowperwood novels in 1926, what function could they possibly

serve in his revising and publishing of *The Financier*?

At a time when he was thousands of miles and weeks of time away from America, and when money was literally pouring into his purse, why should Dreiser be concerned over the cost of a mailed package? And could that package come to him overseas, as he seems to suggest, by "express"?

Dreiser, as a matter of fact, was making considerable revisions in his own set of *Financier* galleys during his tour abroad--but to have combined two distinct and separated chapters into a new one at this late state of the publication process? It bears looking into.

Finally, what "romanticism" is involved in the first and third chapters of *The Financier*?

Answers to these questions will make it clear that whatever work of fiction it is that "seems very effective now" to Dreiser, it is surely not the text of his revised *Financier*.

The letter in question is omitted from the three volumes of Dreiser letters published by the University of Pennsylvania Press, but the autograph letter is on file in the Dreiser Collection at UP. Except for a single point, to be dealt with later, the autograph copy duplicates the text printed by Louise Campbell. Dreiser's sole effort at dating is an "Aug 1--" scrawled like an afterthought in the lower left-hand corner, which later created the necessity for assigning a year of composition.

Someone at UP apparently disagreed with Mrs. Campbell's date of 1926 and assigned a better one: 1945, while Dreiser was at work on *The Stoic*. It is not difficult to see why this date should be suggested as the appropriate one. In all of its internal evidence the letter points less to a time of proof-reading than to a period of original composition and revision. Dreiser habitually sent manuscript to Louise Campbell for editing and typing, and as a measure of his progress he enjoyed keeping track of his chapters by number. From time to time he asked Louise to compose prose pieces, book reviews, for instance--or synopses. Specifically, Dreiser's "Lengel suggests" would point toward this practice and may well have been a deciding factor in assigning the 1945 date. William C. Lengel had continued to perform occasional chores for Dreiser for years after both worked at Butterick, and it was Lengel's stated opinion that when Dreiser came to completing the "Trilogy of Desire" he should acknowledge the many years which had elapsed since the second volume by prefacing his concluding volume with a resume of earlier portions of the

Cowperwood story, a precis which would serve to jog the memories of older fans and prepare the minds of new readers for the end of the long story. This information, along with knowledge that Louise Campbell had served Dreiser as editor-typist until his final days, makes it clear that his letter concerns not *The Financier*, but *The Stoic*.

Such a conclusion would be supported by an examination of chapters one and three of both the 1912 and 1927 *Financiers*. Apart from a consistent tendency to condense, these chapters in the revision are extremely similar; in no sense were the two combined into one. Also, no "romanticism" is involved, unless that rubric can be stretched to encompass the Darwinist lobster-squid duel or the boy financier's first coup, a profitable purchase of soap at an auction. Most references in Dreiser's letter to Louise would appear to confirm 1945 as the date of composition. Lengel's suggestion had been made by that time, Louise Campbell was actively engaged in editing for Dreiser, and he was striving to guide *The Stoic* through a slow and painful metamorphosis from early holographs and type-scripts into a final structure for submission to Doubleday.

Unfortunately, all of these clues are superficial. Under close examination the 1945 dating serves no better than 1926. For one thing, Dreiser was writing extremely few letters in August, 1945. His rapidly dwindling energies were concentrated upon his final attempt to finish *The Stoic*. His occasional letters were not dashed off in the casual manner of the "Aug 1--" note, but concerned matters of serious personal concern. Also, the holograph letters of that period lack the vigor of the script in the letter to Louise. Although Mrs. Campbell was working for Dreiser in 1945, she was preparing an edited version of *The Bulwark*. Helen Richardson, lately made Mrs. Dreiser, was making certain that the major influence upon her husband's work now was hers and hers alone, and in fact she was doing Dreiser's typing on semi-final copy for the last Cowperwood novel.

In comparing the printed letter to Louise with its holograph original, an interesting disparity is revealed. The fourth sentence should read, *not*: "Publishers agree it will be a good thing," but rather: "Publishers here agree it will be a good thing" (to have synopses). The "here" of course becomes ludicrous when thought of in 1926 terms, with Dreiser abroad, and it is only slightly more credible in 1945 terms, with Dreiser in Hollywood. His publishers were always in New York, and thus the letter most likely dates from a time when Dreiser was working on *The Stoic* in that area. The best candidate for the new date is 1932. Indeed, if we compare Dreiser's circumstances and the letter once more, we find that

1932 is the only time when it could possibly have been written.

In that Depression year, Dreiser was making his first concerted effort to compose *The Stoic*. Badly hit financially, he had retreated to the Southwest temporarily in order to facilitate his writing. For a time he enjoyed considerable success, sending manuscript chapters regularly to his secretary, Evelyn Light, who in turn prepared and forwarded typed copies to Louise for editing. It proved to be an effective mechanism, this Dreiser-Light-Campbell trio, a mini-assembly line for fiction. But it did not work so well after Dreiser returned to Manhattan in July and became enmeshed in the complications of his personal and business life, which included the bankruptcy of Horace Liveright, his publisher. Upon Dreiser's request, Mrs. Campbell was offering pointed criticism of the story as it proceeded, and his combining of chapters one and three of *The Stoic* was an attempt both to shorten the beginning of the novel and to modify the somewhat idealized and, to Louise, unbelievable love play of Cowperwood and his youthful mistress, Berenice Fleming. Because the Liveright collapse had at one stroke seriously diminished Dreiser's regular income, expenses were much on his mind and figured prominently in his correspondence of the 1932 era. It is in this apprehensive mood that he inquires as to the cost of sending manuscript from Philadelphia to New York. As *The Stoic* got underway, Dreiser mailed chapters to his friend Lengel, now an editor on *Cosmopolitan*, who responded during the summer of 1932 with his suggestion that the concluding book of the trilogy be prefaced by synopses of earlier portions; the desired effect would be something akin to a chapter of exposition, setting the stage for the drama of Cowperwood's final exploits. Thus Dreiser's relaying of this proposal to Louise Campbell.

Finally, the validity of the 1932 date may be tested by inserting Dreiser's letter into the sequence of his correspondence for that year. As it happens, June, July, and August of 1932 were months during which Dreiser was writing to or hearing from Louise Campbell on a near-daily basis. Let us set the letter into the pattern of this interchange. Dreiser's communique just preceding his "Aug 1--" note is dated July 31. It contains the news that he is working on chapter 54, that when he has ten revised chapters he will send them on to Louise, and then he says:

One question: should I or should you make a brief synopsis of Vols 1 and 2 and put them in the front of this one by way of introduction(?).

This leads credibly into his note written the next day and requesting that she undertake the synopses. The next letter to Louise (undated in her book, but assigned to August 8 in the Elias edition of letters) makes reference to the 45 chapters Dreiser had mentioned receiving from Louise and says:

As I wrote you chapters 1 and 3 were combined--with most of 3 constituting the opening and a condensed version of this 1/3 of No. 1--the close.

Clearly, Dreiser had written Louise for the first time about combining chapters on August 1, 1932, and here the letter finds its logical home.

REVIEWS

Critical Essays on Theodore Dreiser

Critical Essays on Theodore Dreiser, by
Donald Pizer. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1981,
xiii & 343 pp. \$25.00

In his introduction to *Critical Essays on Theodore Dreiser*, Donald Pizer identifies "three distinctive though overlapping phases in the criticism of Theodore Dreiser and his works." During the first phase, beginning in 1900 with the reviews of *Sister Carrie* and dominating Dreiser criticism for the first twenty-five years, Dreiser's works were frequently the focal point of a polemic battle pitting proponents of literary freedom against advocates of decency. As Pizer points out, Dreiser, to his defenders, was a symbol of literature's right "to ignore or openly challenge the conventional beliefs and genteel codes of American life" To his detractors, Dreiser's work was permeated by "the howl of atavistic animalism" and as such was not only an affront to "man's effort to control these aspects of his animal past through reason and will" but also an ignorance of literature's obligation to encourage and guide this effort.

During the 1930s, after *An American Tragedy* had established Dreiser as a major author, critics became less interested in the moral and ethical implications of his work and more concerned about his intellectual soundness. But once again the critical debate transcended the work itself to take on cultural and political overtones. The "liberal critics," to borrow Lionel Trilling's term, tended to excuse Dreiser's philosophical and artistic limitations in deference to his compassion for the downtrodden and realistic treatment of his material. On the other hand, his detractors, many of them

offended by Dreiser's left-wing sympathies, focused on his political and philosophical inconsistencies as well as his artistic crudities. As Pizer summarizes the attacks during this phase, ". . . he became a prime target for those critics who themselves had been party sympathizers during the early 1930s but who had rejected the leadership and ideology of the party as the decade progressed. And since it was Dreiser's intellect which was suspect in his continual support of Communism, what better way to demonstrate Dreiser's vacuity than to point out the inadequacies of the ideas in his fiction?"

Over the two decades following Dreiser's death in 1945, the work of Robert Elias, Charles C. Walcutt and W. A. Swanberg as well as the availability of the Dreiser Collection at the University of Pennsylvania launched the third phase in Dreiser criticism, a phase characterized by a shift "from the use of him as a cultural symbol to a close examination of his career and work." Instead of feeling the need to justify or denigrate Dreiser's literature, critics began to concentrate on the emerging biographical data, the correspondence and the manuscripts in an effort to interpret Dreiser's literature and gain a clearer understanding of his power. Speaking of this "scholarly phase," Pizer notes, "Criticism of Dreiser thus has rejected the old conventional judgments about him as a doctrinaire naturalist, as an inept novelist, and as a superficial social realist and now seeks to discover the springs of his permanence in the complex actualities of his fiction."

Ranging from 1900 to 1977 and organized chronologically, the essays Pizer has selected for this volume tend to dramatize these phases of Dreiser criticism. For example, in the section of general essays, Pizer sandwiches Stuart P. Sherman's scathing rebuke, "The Naturalism of Mr. Dreiser" (1915) between the evaluations of Dreiser defenders, Edgar Lee Masters' "Theodore the Poet" (1915) and Sherwood Anderson's "Dreiser" (1915). Representing the second phase of Dreiser criticism, such attacks as Paul Elmer More's "Modern Currents" (1928) and Lionel Trilling's "Reality in America" (1950) bracket the essay of apologist Eliseo Vivas, "Dreiser, An Inconsistent Mechanist" (1938). The general section then concludes with more current and nonpartisan studies, such as Charles C. Walcutt's "Theodore Dreiser: The Wonder and Terror of Life" (1956), Roger Asselineau's "Theodore Dreiser's Transcendentalism" (1961), William L. Phillips' "The Imagery of Dreiser's Novels" (1963) and Pizer's own "American Literary Naturalism: The Example of Dreiser" (1977). The volume's following sections on individual novels employ the same chronological pattern and contrasting juxtaposition.

As the above paragraph suggests, Pizer has limited *Critical Essays on Theodore Dreiser* primarily to criticism of Dreiser's fiction, specifically his novels. In Pizer's judgment, little significant work has been done on Dreiser's other literary forms, and the essays of a biographical, historical and bibliographical nature are limited in their general interest. Although he has included some "biased and obtuse" evaluations to reflect the polemics Dreiser's fiction generated, Pizer has avoided most "journalistic criticism," the bulk of which "repetitiously and superficially echoes such familiar notes as Dreiser's suspect philosophy, weak prose, and excessive documentation." The exceptions are the best of Mencken's reviews, which Pizer includes, calling them "literary journalism at its best."

Having exercised these principles of selection, Pizer has produced a volume of thirty-seven significant essays which are placed in a meaningful historical context and bring Dreiser criticism up to date. As such *Critical Essays on Theodore Dreiser* will supersede *The Stature of Theodore Dreiser* (1955) as a mainstay of Dreiser scholarship.

--Richard W. Dowell, Indiana State University

DREISER NEWS & NOTES

Northeastern University Press has republished the *Letters of H. L. Mencken*, selected and annotated by Guy J. Forgue with a new forward by Daniel Aaron. The *Letters of H. L. Mencken* was originally published in 1961 by Alfred A. Knopf; however, Northeastern is making the book available for the first time in paperback. This volume includes eighty-four Mencken letters to Dreiser, the first on March 7, 1909, and the last on March 19, 1943. . . . Christopher Lehmann-Haupt, *New York Times* book reviewer, reported in his column on November 6, 1980, that recent curiosity about Dreiser's current popularity had led him to contact some publishers. His findings were as follows: ". . . Dreiser's major books, *Sister Carrie* and *An American Tragedy*, are still selling along as briskly as ever. . . . *Books in Print* lists no fewer than eight paperback editions of that old English course standby, *Sister Carrie*. And New American Library . . . finds that no sales trend up or down is discernible for the last 10 years or so. Orders keep coming in at a steady pace." In fact, George Stade, chairman of Columbia College's English Department, expressed the belief that if anything Dreiser is "making something of a comeback among young readers. 'Kids seem to like the straightforward, realistic writers.'"